

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/943,086	08/31/2001	Alan Asay	. P 268225 RM-1	8118	
	90 01/23/2007 NTHROP SHAW PIT	ľMAN: LLP	EXAM	INER	
P.O. BOX 10500			CALLAHAN, PAUL E		
MCLEAN, VA 2	2102	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2137		
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE	
3 MON	THS	01/23/2007	PAP	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/943,086	ASAY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_			
	Paul Callahan	2137				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence add	dress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNION (66a). In no event, however, may a refill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON cause the application to become AB	CATION.  eply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this co  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 Se	eptember 2006.					
,	action is non-final.					
, ·—						
closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1 and 57-75 is/are pending in the appl	lication.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 57-75</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	•					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 August 2001</u> is/are:		jected to by the Examine	r.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			R 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		•			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		pplication No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			Stage			
application from the International Bureau	•	•	_			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	s)/Mail Date				
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	5)  Notice of Ir	nformal Patent Application				

Art Unit: 2137

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 and 57-75 are pending and have been examined.

## Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 57-75 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1 and 57-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Independent claims 1, 63, and 68 each recite the negative limitation: "...the financial assurance not being a payment request or a payment authorization of the transaction itself..." Such a negative limitation fails to meet the written description requirement of 35 USC 112 1st paragraph since such a limitation lacks any basis in the disclosure. From MPEP 2173.05(i): Any claim containing a negative limitation which

Art Unit: 2137

does not have basis in the original disclosure should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 57-62, 64-67, and 69-75 are dependent on claims 1, 63, and 68 and are thereby rejected on the same basis as are those claims.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1, 57-61, and 63-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al., US 5,815,657, and Deming, US 4,823,264.

As for claim 1, Williams et al. teaches a method of managing reliance in an electronic transaction system (Abstract) the method comprising: obtaining electronic signals representing subscriber assurance of an attribute of a subscriber to the system (fig. 29), the subscriber assurance issued by a certification authority (fig. 30, col. 11 lines 30-37, col. 36 lines 63-67, col. 37 lines 1-12): obtaining electronic signals representing a request for transactional assurance based on at least the subscriber assurance based on a transaction involving the subscriber (col. 13 line 40 through col. 14 line 23: the Payment Manager receives the request for transactional assurance (i.e.,

Art Unit: 2137

authorization to pay or payment) from the merchant, and receives certificate information from the user (user's wallet manager)); determining whether to provide the requested transactional assurance, based on at least the subscriber assurance (col. 13 line 40 through col. 14 line 23: the Payment Manager receives the request for transactional assurance (i.e., authorization to pay or payment) from the merchant, and receives certificate information from the user (user's wallet manager)); and, depending on the said determining, issuing electronic signals representing transactional assurance to the relying party (fig. 34: Payment Window). Williams fails to teach a transactional financial assurance that is not a payment request or a payment authorization of the transaction itself. However Demming does teach this step (Abstract, col. 1 lines 32-67, col. 3 lines 47-55). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this step into the system of Williams. It would be desirable to do so as such an assurance prevents extraneous payment authorization or payment requests from being transmitted.

As for claim 57, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the subscriber assurance comprises (a) an identification assurance of the identity of the subscriber, or (b) an authorization assurance of authorization of the subscriber, or (c) both (a) and (b) (col. 13 line 41 through col. 14 line 6: Payment Manager receives a user certificate containing I.D. information).

Art Unit: 2137

As for claim 58, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the subscriber assurance comprises electronic signals representing a certificate (col. 13 line 41 through col. 14 line 6: Payment Manager receives a user certificate containing I.D. information).

As for claim 59, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the determining is based also on information provided by the relying party (col. 13 line 41 through col. 14 line 6: Payment Manager receives a user certificate containing I.D. information and certificate information from the Merchant).

As for claim 60, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the request for transactional assurance comes from the relying party (col. 13 lines 40-53: Merchant payment request also contains financial assurance information such as the merchant certificate sent to the payment manager).

As for claim 61, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the request for transactional assurance includes a request for a guarantee of an aspect of the transaction and comprising (col. 13 lines 40-50: Merchant sends transaction details and his certificate): validating information in the request for transaction financial assurance to determine whether to provide the guarantee for the aspect of the transaction (col. 16 lines 19-25: Merchant is verified); and sending electronic signals representing an indication of whether the aspect of the transaction will be guaranteed (col. 16 lines 19-

Art Unit: 2137

25: a message is sent as to whether Merchant is verified or not, and therefore whether payment will be made of not).

Claims 63-74 are directed towards a computer program that directs a computer to carry out the method steps of claims 1 and 57-61. Claims 63-74 contain substantially the same limitations as claims 1 and 57-61. Therefore claims 63-74 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1 and 57-61.

#### Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Art Unit: 2137

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PEC 1-18-07

Paul (all ham

Cynthia Britt

Auzi38

FRIMARY

FRIMARY

1-22-07